



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,765	02/20/2002	Kazuhiro Ishida	017446-0323	3462
22428	7590	04/29/2009	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			ALVAREZ, RAQUEL	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3000 K STREET NW				3688
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/077,765	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ISHIDA, KAZUHIRO
	<b>Examiner</b> Raquel Alvarez	<b>Art Unit</b> 3688

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 34-54 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 34-54 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/DS/02)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/18/09

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 2/19/2009.
2. Claims 1-33 have been cancelled.
3. Claims 34-54 are presented for examination.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Based on Supreme Court precedent <sup>1</sup> and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing.<sup>2</sup> If either of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is non a patent eligible process under § 101 and should be rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

**Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as drawn to a non-statutory subject matter.** The applicant is reciting only method steps such as “issuing...receiving”, the applicant has not recited an apparatus or device to perform these limitations and without apparatus or device these limitations are just mental steps. Mentioning computer in the preamble is not enough, if the body of the claims each of the steps can be performed manually.

In claim 48 the steps are related to a mental process, which is not patentable. Indeed, it is not tied to another statutory class or does not change or switch statutory class (such as a particular apparatus or physical module or device) or does not

transform the underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. See MPEP §2106.IV.B: *Determine Whether the Claimed Invention Falls Within An Enumerated Statutory Category.*

Examiner suggests applicant inserts a device in one or more of the essential steps of the body of the claims in order to overcome this rejection.

<sup>1</sup> Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

<sup>2</sup> The supreme court recognized that this test is not necessary fixed or permanent and may evolve with technological advances. Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63,71 (1972)

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 34-35, 39-42, 48-49, 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura (5,987,424 hereinafter Nakamura).

With respect to claims 34, 39-41, 46-48, 53-54 Nakamura teaches a communication terminal (i.e. subscriber telephone set 1); a registration request issuing means for issuing a registration request for advertisement information broadcast from an advertisement information broadcast server and receiving means for receiving advertisement information which is broadcast from said advertisement information broadcast server, based on said registration request (i.e. the telephone set under

Art Unit: 3688

contract to receive messages)(steps 1301 and 1302); and a display means for displaying said advertisement information received by said receiving means (Figure 14).

With respect to claims 35, 42, 49, Nakamura further teaches a registration cancellation means for requesting to stop broadcasting said advertisement information from said advertisement information broadcast server (i.e. exchange 4 determining if a cancellation request was received from the subscriber telephone set 1)((col. 24, lines 29-33).

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 36-38, 43-45, 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Kenney (5,515,424 hereinafter Kenney).

Claims 36-38, 43-45 and 50-52 further recite automatically receiving advertisement information on a standby screen. Kenney teaches “the monitor 18 would display informational screens for a period of 8-10 seconds each when the phone is not in use. These still images are stored in a memory module 38, which could be a disk drive, in the phone. In some cases, the data could be downloaded from a central administration point” (col. 4, lines 27-32). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included automatically receiving advertisement information on a standby screen because such a modification would without any human interaction attract passerby to the telephone terminals.

**Response to Arguments**

9. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Nakamura doesn't teach a portable communication terminal. The Examiner wants to point out that "A portable communication terminal..." is only present in the preamble of claim 1 and that since it is not claimed in the body of the claim, no patentable weight has been given to the portable communication terminal. Even if this feature were to be claimed, making a device portable it is old and well known in order to provide portability.

10. Applicant argues that Nakamura doesn't teach that the communication terminal has a registration request for issuing a registration request for advertisement information from an advertisement information broadcast server. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because teaches the subscriber under contract and receiving advertisement via exchange.

11. With respect to displaying advertisement on a standby screen. Kenney teaches "the monitor 18 would display informational screens for a period of 8-10 seconds each when the phone is not in use.

**Point of contact**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James w. Myhre can be reached on (571)272-6722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Raquel Alvarez/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688

Raquel Alvarez  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3688

R.A.  
4/27/2009

Application/Control Number: 10/077,765

Art Unit: 3688

Page 7